

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
WESTERN DIVISION**

VERTIS JEROME ANTHONY,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 7:25-cv-00293-MHH-SGC
)	
STATE OF ALABAMA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION


On May 9, 2025, the magistrate judge entered a report in which she recommended that the Court dismiss this habeas petition for lack of jurisdiction. (Doc. 3). Mr. Anthony has objected to the report. (Doc. 4).

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district judge must “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objective to.”).

Here, Mr. Anthony’s objections are difficult to understand, but they do not appear to address the fact that Mr. Anthony already has filed a habeas petition

regarding the state conviction at issue, his first petition was resolved on the merits, and he has not obtained permission from the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals to file another petition. Therefore, the Court overrules Mr. Anthony's objections, adopts the magistrate judge's report, and accepts her recommendation. By separate order, the Court will dismiss this action for lack of jurisdiction over this successive § 2254 petition.

DONE and **ORDERED** this July 2, 2025.



MADELINE HUGHES HAIKALA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE